arXiv:1509.02300v3 [math.DG] 24 Feb 2017

Explicit construction of the complex structure on the six dimensional sphere

Gábor Etesi

Department of Geometry, Mathematical Institute, Faculty of Science,

Budapest University of Technology and Economics,

Egry J. u. 1, H ép., H-1111 Budapest, Hungary *

February 27, 2017

Abstract

New proof of existence of the novel complex structure on the six-sphere, followed by an explicit computation of its underlying integrable almost complex tensor by the aid of inner automorphisms of the octonions, is exhibited. Both are elementary and self-contained however the size and complexity of the emerging almost complex tensor field on the six-sphere is perplexing.

AMS Classification: Primary: 32J17, 32J25; Secondary: 22C05, 53C56
Keywords: *Six-sphere; Complex structure; Octonions*

1 Introduction

Unlike their real counterparts, complex manifolds are quite rigid objects therefore constructing new examples is often not an easy task. Nevertheless there are two main islands, both within the *Kähler realm*, of the archipelago of complex manifolds comprising tractable situations. One is the category of *projective manifolds*, standing in the focal point of algebraic geometry. The other one is the category of *Stein manifolds* which, on the contrary, can be conveniently studied with the techniques of complex analysis in several variables. Although the in-between *terra incognita* is not so easily accessable, it is still quite populated: its habitants are the numerous irregular neither projective nor Stein—or even not Kähler—manifolds, either compact or non-compact. Examples in two complex dimensions are for example the various non-algebraic tori, Hopf surfaces, Inue surfaces, non-algebraic $K3$ surfaces, etc. (cf., e.g. [1, Chapter VI] for a survey of irregular complex surfaces) while in higher dimensions the picture is not so clear yet. But in all dimensions the deviation, at least from the algebraic scenario, is captured in some extent by the concept of the algebraic dimension of a complex manifold i.e., the transcendental degree over $\mathbb{C}$ of its field of global meromorphic functions. Compact complex manifolds whose algebraic and geometric dimensions match (sometimes called *Moishezon manifolds*) are still not far from being algebraic: it is known that after performing finitely many blowing-ups they become projective algebraic. However in general the lower the algebraic dimension of a manifold is the larger its detachment is from the familiar world of algebraic manifolds.

*e-mail: etesi@math.bme.hu

An interesting family of higher dimensional non-algebraic examples relevant to us here is based on even dimensional compact Lie groups. *Samelson* discovered [11] that they carry complex structures which are surely non-Kähler if the underlying group is simply connected and simple. We guess therefore that in fact they are as far from being algebraic as possible: we *conjecture* that the algebraic dimension of an even dimensional compact, connected, simply connected and simple Lie group as a complex manifold is always zero. It also has been known for some time that if the six dimensional sphere carries a complex structure then this compact complex 3-manifold must be of zero algebraic dimension [2].

In this paper we shall construct explicitly the recent complex structure on the six dimensional sphere found in [4]. The proof is based on identifying S^6 with an exceptional *conjugate orbit* [3] inside the exceptional compact Lie group G_2 and then restricting a Samelson complex structure on G_2 to this orbit. The proof to be presented here is elementary and self-contained hence is independent of our former Yang–Mills–Higgs theoretic approach [4]; nevertheless those considerations definitely have been used here as a source of ideas. We just note that meanwhile the treatment in [4] is based on the well-known $\mathrm{SU}(3)$-fibration: the *projection* (i.e., a surjective mapping) $\pi : \mathrm{G}_2 \to S^6$, our present proof rests on a less-known but very remarkable *injection* (i.e., an injective mapping) $f : S^6 \to \mathrm{G}_2$. Therefore the two approaches are dual to each other in this sense.

The paper is organized as follows. Sect. 2 consists of a self-contained and elementary proof that S^6 can carry complex structures (cf. Theorem 2.1). Then we make a contact between known results on the Dolbeault cohomologies of a complex structure on G_2 and on S^6: certain Dolbeault cohomology groups of G_2 and of S^6 are both non-trivial and are isomorphic via $S^6 \subset \mathrm{G}_2$ considered as a complex-analytic embedding (cf. Lemma 2.1). It also has been known for a long time (cf. e.g. [8, 6]) that if S^6 carries a complex structure then there exist "exotic $\mathbb{C}P^3$'s" i.e., complex manifolds diffeomoprhic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$ as real 6-manifolds however not complex-analytically isomorphic to it. Here we prove another striking consequence: the complex sructure on S^6 implies the existence of "large exotic $\mathbb{C}^3$'s" in a similar sense (cf. Lemma 2.2). By a *large exotic* $\mathbb{C}^3$ we mean a complex manifold which is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^6$ however is not complex analytically equivalent to the standard $\mathbb{C}^3$, moreover does not admit a complex-analytic embedding into the standard $\mathbb{C}^3$ (the failure of the higher dimensional analogue of the Riemannian mapping theorem implies the existence of an abundance of *small exotic* $\mathbb{C}^3$ *'s* i.e., open complex analytic subsets not complex-analytically equivalent to the sandard $\mathbb{C}^3$).

In Sect. 3 we outline the explicit construction of the integrable almost complex tensor field on S^6 underlying its complex structure. The construction is based on looking at the aforementioned conjugate orbit as the subset of *inner automorphisms* within the full automorphism group of the octonions which is G_2 (cf. Lemma 3.1). In this way one can find open subsets with smooth gauges on S^6 in which the almost complex tensor field can be written as local 6×6 matrix functions. However the result is so unexpectedly complicated that we cannot display it here in order to protect environment. Nevertheless the steps toward its construction are clearly explained and the curious reader can reproduce the calculations (using a computer is strongly advised) by himself or even go further and bring these matrices into a more digestable form. Our computations here at least allow us to conclude that all the complex structures found in Theorem 2.1 are in fact complex analitically isomorphic (cf. Theorem 3.1).

Finally Sect. 4 is an appendix and has been added in order to gain a more comprehensive picture. Following [3] we re-prove that the conjugate orbit of G_2 playing the central role here, when regarded as a continuous map $f : S^6 \to \mathrm{G}_2$, represents the generator of $\pi_6(\mathrm{G}_2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$ (cf. Theorem 4.1).

Acknowledgement. The author is grateful to N.A. Daurtseva, Sz. Szabó, R. Szőke, P. Vrana and D. Wang for the stimulating discussions. The math software Maple™ version 2015.1 has been extensively used to carry out the massive but *strictly symbolic* calculations in Sect. 3.

2 Proof of existence

In this section we present a formal proof that the six dimensional sphere can carry complex structures. The proof is based on identifying S^6 with an exceptional conjugate orbit inside the exceptional compact Lie group G_2 and then restricting the Samelson complex structure of G_2 to this orbit. The proof to be presented here is elementary and self-contained hence is independent of our former Yang–Mills–Higgs theoretic approach [4].

Recall [10, 11] that if G is an even dimensional compact real Lie group with real Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ the complex linear subspace $\mathfrak{s}\subset\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}:=\mathfrak{g}\otimes_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{C}$ is a *Samelson subalgebra* if it is a complex Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ satisfying $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\mathfrak{s}=\frac{1}{2}\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{R}}\cap\mathfrak{g}=\{0\}$ as real subspaces within $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. One can demonstrate that at least one Samelson subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ always exists if $\mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra of a *compact* even dimensional Lie group. These properties imply a vector space decomposition $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}=\mathfrak{s}\oplus\overline{\mathfrak{s}}$ hence the existence of a real linear isomorphism $\mathrm{Re}:\mathfrak{s}\to\mathfrak{g}$ given by $W\mapsto\mathrm{Re}\,W$ for all $W\in\mathfrak{s}$ and a real linear map $J_{\mathfrak{s}}:\mathfrak{g}\to\mathfrak{g}$ with $J_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathrm{Re}\,W):=-\mathrm{Im}\,W$ satisfying $J_{\mathfrak{s}}^2=-\mathrm{Id}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Consequently a choice of a Samelson subalgebra gives rise to a complex vector space $(\mathfrak{g},J_{\mathfrak{s}})$ such that $\mathfrak{g}^{1,0}:=\mathfrak{s}$ is the $+\sqrt{-1}$-eigenspace while $\mathfrak{g}^{0,1}:=\overline{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the $-\sqrt{-1}$-eigenspace of its complexification $J_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\mathbb{C}}:\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}\to\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. The operator $J_{\mathfrak{s}}=J_{\mathfrak{s},e}$ on $\mathfrak{g}=T_eG$ can be extended to a left-invariant almost complex structure $J_{\mathfrak{s}}$ over the whole G by putting $J_{\mathfrak{s},g}:T_gG\to T_gG$ to be $J_{\mathfrak{s},g}:=L_{g*}J_{\mathfrak{s},e}L_{g*}^{-1}$. In this way we come up with an almost complex manifold $(G,J_{\mathfrak{s}})$. In fact the Lie algebra property of $\mathfrak{g}^{1,0}$ has not been exploited so far; because $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}=\mathfrak{g}^{1,0}\oplus\mathfrak{g}^{0,1}$ it additionally tells us that

$$\left[\mathfrak{g}^{1,0}\,,\,\mathfrak{g}^{1,0}\right]^{0,1}=0$$

also holds. The identification $X\mapsto X^{1,0}:=\frac{1}{2}(X-\sqrt{-1}\,J_{\mathfrak{s}}X)$ of real vector fields with $(1,0)$-type complex ones over G maps left-invariant real fields into left-invariant $(1,0)$-type ones and these latter fields can be viewed as $(1,0)$-type complex Lie algebra elements. Observing that $(X,Y)\mapsto[X^{1,0},Y^{1,0}]^{0,1}$ is $C^\infty(G;\mathbb{R})$-bilinear we recognize that the vanishing commutator above actually says that the Nijenhuis tensor of $J_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is zero. Consequently $(G,J_{\mathfrak{s}})$ is integrable to a homogeneous complex manifold $Y_{\mathfrak{s}}$ in light of the Newlander–Nirenberg theorem. Another way to see this is to take the corresponding complex Lie subgroup $S\subset G^{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\mathfrak{s}\subset\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $Y_{\mathfrak{s}}=G^{\mathbb{C}}/S$ as a complex manifold because this quotient as a real manifold is diffeomorphic to G, essentially because $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{R}}\cap\mathfrak{g}=\{0\}$ holds in $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$, cf. [10, Proposition 2.3].

After these preliminaries consider the 14 dimensional real compact exceptional Lie group G_2. As we outlined above it can be given the structure of a compact complex 7-manifold; more precisely according to a result[1] [10, Example on p. 123] there is a family $Y_{\alpha\beta}$, with $\alpha+\sqrt{-1}\,\beta\in\mathbb{C}^+\sqcup\mathbb{C}^-$, of pairwise non-isomorphic compact homogeneous complex 7-manifolds whose underlying real spaces are all diffeomorphic to G_2. This Lie group has moreover a maximal subgroup $\mathrm{SU}(3)\subset\mathrm{G}_2$ and let $\Lambda\in\mathrm{G}_2$ be the generator of its center i.e., $\Lambda\in Z(\mathrm{SU}(3))\cong\mathbb{Z}_3$. Motivated by [3] we will focus our attention to the *conjugate orbit*

$$O(\Lambda):=\{g\Lambda g^{-1}\,|\,g\in\mathrm{G}_2\}\tag{1}$$

passing through this generator. It is a real submanifold of G_2 diffeomorphic to $\mathrm{G}_2/\mathrm{SU}(3)\cong S^6$. Let $\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ be the complexification of G_2. By compactness of G_2 there exists a diffeomorphism $\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}\cong T\mathrm{G}_2$ as a real manifold hence we can use the zero section of the tangent bundle to write $\mathrm{G}_2\subset\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$. Our orbit also complexifies to a complex submanifold $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}\subset\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ complex-analytically isomorphic to $\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{SU}(3)^{\mathbb{C}}\cong\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{C})\cong(S^6)^{\mathbb{C}}$ where $(S^6)^{\mathbb{C}}\subset\mathbb{C}^7$ is the "complex six-sphere" whose points satisfy $z_1^2+\cdots+z_7^2=1$ with $z_1,\ldots,z_7\in\mathbb{C}$. Restriction then gives $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}\cong TO(\Lambda)$ and $O(\Lambda)\subset O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$. This is in accordance with the fact that $(S^6)^{\mathbb{C}}\cong TS^6$ as a real manifold and with the existence of an

[1] But we will also recover this result explicitly in Sect. 3.

embedding $S^6\subset(S^6)^{\mathbb{C}}$ by the zero section. In this way we come up with a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathrm{G}_2 & \subset & \mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}} & \cong & T\mathrm{G}_2\\
\cup & & \cup & & \\
O(\Lambda) & \subset & O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}} & \cong & TO(\Lambda)\\
\wr\| & & \wr\| & & \\
S^6 & \subset & (S^6)^{\mathbb{C}} & \cong & TS^6
\end{array}$$

of complex-analytic or real smooth embeddings and isomorphisms. We proceed further and demonstrate that on G_2 the two structures: its Samelson complex structures and its conjugate orbit are compatible with each other in the sense that these complex structures restrict to the orbit.

Theorem 2.1. *For given (extended) real numbers $a\in(\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\})\cup\{\infty\}$ and $b\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ let Y_{ab} be a compact complex 7-manifold diffeomorphic to G_2 stemming from the Samelson subalgebra $\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\subset\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$. Consider the exceptional conjugate orbit $O(\Lambda)$ diffeomorphic to S^6 within G_2.*

Then the complex structure of Y_{ab} restricts to this conjugate orbit rendering S^6 a compact complex 3-manifold $X_{ab}\subset Y_{ab}$.

Proof. Let $h\in O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}\subset\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ be a point, $L_h:\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}\to\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $L_{h*}:T\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}\to T\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ the corresponding left translations. The latter operator can be used to translate the tangent space $T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}\subset T_h\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ back to the origin hence to obtain a 6 dimensional complex subspace $L_{h*}^{-1}(T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})\subset T_e\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}=\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$. Define

$$C:=\{h\in O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}\,|\,\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap L_{h*}^{-1}(T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}))=3\text{ and }\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\cap L_{h*}^{-1}(T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}))=3\}\ .$$

Since $\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}=\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\oplus\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}$ with corresponding $J_{ab}^{\mathbb{C}}:\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}\to\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ it is clear that $\emptyset\subseteqq C\subseteqq O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ consists of those points $h\in O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ where $J_{ab}^{\mathbb{C}}$ restricts well to the complex subspaces $L_{h*}^{-1}(T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})\subset\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$. Our aim is to demonstrate that in fact $\emptyset\neq C=O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ by evoking a standard closed-open argument and exploiting the connectedness of the complex conjugate orbit $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$.

First we make sure that C is not empty. The standard root basis in $\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ looks like[2]

$$\{H_{a,\pm b},V_{\pm1},V_{\pm2},V_{\pm3},U_{\pm1},U_{\pm2},U_{\pm3}\}\tag{2}$$

where $a\in(\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\})\cup\{\infty\}$ and $b\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ (this parameter space is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^+\sqcup\mathbb{C}^-$). It has the following pleasant properties: first $\{H_{a,\pm b}\}$ span the complexified Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}\subset\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$; second $\{H_{a,\pm b},V_{\pm k}\}$ with $k=1,2,3$ span $\mathfrak{su}(3)^{\mathbb{C}}\subset\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$; third $\{H_{a,+b},V_{+1},V_{-2},V_{-3},U_{+1},U_{-2},U_{+3}\}$ span the complete family of (solvable) Samelson subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\subset\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ parameterized by $\mathbb{C}^+\sqcup\mathbb{C}^-$. In addition we find that $\overline{H}_{a,+b}=H_{a,-b}$, $\overline{V}_{+k}=V_{-k}$ and $\overline{U}_{+k}=U_{-k}$ hence the remaining basis elements span the complex conjugate subalgebra $\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\subset\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$. Consider $\lambda\in\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ satisfying $\exp\lambda=\Lambda$; then any curve in our conjugate orbit (1) looks like $t\mapsto\exp(tX)\exp\lambda\exp(-tX)$ hence its tangent vector, when translated back to the origin, is $[X,\lambda]\in\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$. Taking the vector space decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}=\mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}}\oplus\mathfrak{su}(3)^{\mathbb{C}}$ and recalling that $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}\cong\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{SU}(3)^{\mathbb{C}}$ we find $L_{\Lambda*}^{-1}(T_\Lambda O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})=[\mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}},\lambda]=\mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}}$ because $\lambda\in\mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$. However

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}} &= \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\langle U_{\pm1},U_{\pm2},U_{\pm3}\rangle\\
\mathfrak{s}_{ab} &= \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\langle H_{a,+b},V_{+1},V_{-2},V_{-3},U_{+1},U_{-2},U_{+3}\rangle\\
\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab} &= \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\langle H_{a,-b},V_{-1},V_{+2},V_{+3},U_{-1},U_{+2},U_{-3}\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

[2]An explicit matrix representation of the members of this basis will be exhibited soon in Sect. 3; therefore the interested reader can check all assertions about this basis by hand.

for all a,b consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{\Lambda *}(T_\Lambda O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}) &= \mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap\mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\langle U_{+1},U_{-2},U_{+3}\rangle\\ \overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{\Lambda *}(T_\Lambda O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}) &= \overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\cap\mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\langle U_{-1},U_{+2},U_{-3}\rangle\end{aligned}$$

demonstrating that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{\Lambda *}(T_\Lambda O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) = 3$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{\Lambda *}(T_\Lambda O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) = 3$ i.e., $\Lambda\in C$.

Second we prove that C is closed in $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$. Consider a sequence $\{h_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}\subset C$ converging to a point $h\in O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$. We have $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h_j *}(T_{h_j}O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) = 3$ as well as $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h_j *}(T_{h_j}O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) = 3$ for all $j = 1,2,\dots$ hence taking into account the lower semicontinuity of the intersection dimension

$$\begin{aligned}\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) &= \lim_{j\to+\infty}\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h_j *}(T_{h_j}O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}))\geqq 3\\ \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) &= \lim_{j\to+\infty}\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h_j *}(T_{h_j}O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}))\geqq 3\ .\end{aligned}$$

Assume for instance that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) > 3$. Knowing that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) = 6$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab} = \{0\}$ we would also find in this case that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) < 3$ which violates the second inequality. The case of $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) > 3$ leads to a similar contradiction hence we conclude that $h\in C$. In other words C is closed in $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Third we show that C is open in $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$. Take the Ad-invariant Hermitian scalar product

$$\langle V,W\rangle^{\mathbb{C}} := \mathrm{tr}(V\,\overline{W}^T) \tag{3}$$

on $\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}\subset\mathbb{C}(7)$. Given a point $h\in O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ consider the two orthogonal projections $P:\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}\to\mathfrak{s}_{ab}$ satisfying $P\mathfrak{s}_{ab} = \mathfrak{s}_{ab}$ and $P\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab} = 0$ and the other one $Q_h:\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}\to L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})$. Then

$$\operatorname*{Lim}_{j\to+\infty}(PQ_h)^j:\ \ \mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}\longrightarrow\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})$$

is the orthogonal projection onto the intersection where Lim denotes the operator norm limit. Since in finite dimensions this is equivalent to taking limit with respect to any matrix norm, limit in operator norm implies entriwise limit therefore

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab}\cap L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) = \mathrm{tr}\operatorname*{Lim}_{j\to+\infty}(PQ_h)^j = \lim_{j\to+\infty}\mathrm{tr}(PQ_h)^j = \lim_{j\to+\infty}\Big(\mu_1^j(h)+\dots+\mu_{14}^j(h)\Big)$$

where $\{\mu_1(h),\dots,\mu_{14}(h)\}\subset\mathbb{C}$ denotes the spectrum of PQ_h acting on the 14 dimensional space $\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$. It follows on the one hand that $\mu_n(h) = 1$ or $0\leqq|\mu_n(h)|<1$ because $\operatorname*{Lim}_{j\to+\infty}(PQ_h)^j$ hence its eigenvalues exist; on the other hand if a specific eigenvalue continuously changes for example from $\mu_n(h) = 1$ to $\mu_n(h')\neq 1$ (or conversely) as h approaches h' then $\mu_n^j(h)$ and $\mu_n^j(h')$ behave differently when $j\to+\infty$ hence the intersection dimension can jump suddenly. Therefore we have to compare the spectra of the two operators PQ_h and $PQ_{h'}$. Take a fixed $g\in\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$, unique up to multiplication from the right by an element of $\mathrm{SU}(3)^{\mathbb{C}}\subset\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$, to write $h = g\Lambda g^{-1}$. Then

$$L^{-1}_{h *}(T_h O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}) = g\left(L^{-1}_{\Lambda *}(T_\Lambda O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})\right)g^{-1} = \mathrm{Ad}_g\left(L^{-1}_{\Lambda *}(T_\Lambda O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})\right) \tag{4}$$

consequently if $h' = \varepsilon g\Lambda(\varepsilon g)^{-1}$ where $\varepsilon\in U_e\subset\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an element close to the identity $e\in\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ then $PQ_{h'} = P\,\mathrm{Ad}_\varepsilon\,Q_h\,\mathrm{Ad}_\varepsilon^{-1}$. Therefore the two spectra coincide if P and Ad_ε commute *at least as* $\mathbb{R}$-*linear operators* on the 28 real dimensional simple real Lie algebra $(\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}})^{\mathbb{R}}$. This Lie algebra admits

an Ad-invariant complex structure I coming from multiplication by $\sqrt{-1}$ on $\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$. The invariant complex conjugation on $(\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}})^{\mathbb{R}}$ corresponding to I has real eigenvalues ± 1 hence has eigenspaces invariant under Ad. Therefore the real adjoint representation of $(\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}})^{\mathbb{R}}$ on $(\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}})^{\mathbb{R}}$ is reducible and decomposes into a direct sum of two copies of isomorphic 14 dimensional representations with a corresponding invariant projection. However in fact all 14 dimensional real subspaces are real Ad-invariant, hence in particular the vector space decomposition $(\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}})^{\mathbb{R}} = \mathfrak{s}_{ab}^{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}^{\mathbb{R}}$, too. The corresponding projection P therefore satisfies $P\,\mathrm{Ad}_\varepsilon = \mathrm{Ad}_\varepsilon\,P$ yielding $PQ_{h'} = P\,\mathrm{Ad}_\varepsilon\,Q_h\,\mathrm{Ad}_\varepsilon^{-1} = \mathrm{Ad}_\varepsilon\,PQ_h\,\mathrm{Ad}_\varepsilon^{-1}$ on $(\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}})^{\mathbb{R}}$ demonstrating $\mu_n(h') = \mu_n(h)$ for all $n = 1,\dots,14$. We conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab} \cap L_{h'*}^{-1}(T_{h'}O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) &= \lim_{j\to+\infty}\left(\mu_1^j(h') + \dots + \mu_{14}^j(h')\right) = \lim_{j\to+\infty}\left(\mu_1^j(h) + \dots + \mu_{14}^j(h)\right)\\ &= \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab} \cap L_{h*}^{-1}(T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}))\end{aligned}$$

convincing us that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab} \cap L_{h*}^{-1}(T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}))$ is locally constant. In a similar way we conclude that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab} \cap L_{h*}^{-1}(T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}))$ is also constant locally. Therefore if $h \in C$ and $h' \in O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ is another element in the vicinity of h then $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{s}_{ab} \cap L_{h'*}^{-1}(T_{h'}O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) = 3$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab} \cap L_{h'*}^{-1}(T_{h'}O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})) = 3$ yielding $h' \in C$. Consequently C is open in $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Summing up, the set C is not empty and is both closed and open in $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ therefore taking into account the connectedness of $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}} \cong (S^6)^{\mathbb{C}} \cong TS^6$ we conclude that actually $C = O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$. This implies that over all $h \in O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ the Samelson decompositions $T_h\mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}} = L_{h*}\mathfrak{s}_{ab} \oplus L_{h*}\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}$ induce vector subspace decompositions $T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}} = Z_{ab} \oplus \overline{Z}_{ab}$ where $Z_{ab} := (L_{h*}\mathfrak{s}_{ab}) \cap T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\overline{Z}_{ab} := (L_{h*}\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab}) \cap T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$, both having complex dimensions 3. If $h \in O(\Lambda) \subset O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a real point then $T_hO(\Lambda) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} \cong T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}$ consequently the decomposition $T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}} = Z_{ab} \oplus \overline{Z}_{ab}$ gives rise to a complex vector space structure on the underlying real vector space $T_hO(\Lambda)$ by the general theory. In this way $O(\Lambda)$ inherits an almost complex structure. But this almost complex structure is nothing but the restriction of the integrable Samelson one J_{ab} of G_2 onto $O(\Lambda) \subset \mathrm{G}_2$ hence $O(\Lambda)$ is in fact a complex submanifold $X_{ab} := (O(\Lambda), J_{ab}|_{O(\Lambda)})$ of $Y_{ab} = (\mathrm{G}_2, J_{ab})$. Putting another way if $S_{ab} \subset \mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ denotes the complex Lie subgroup to $\mathfrak{s}_{ab} \subset \mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ then the factorization $Y_{ab} = \mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}/S_{ab}$ is compatible with $O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathrm{G}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ and gives rise to a complex manifold $X_{ab} = O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}}/(S_{ab} \cap O(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})$. Finally note that X_{ab} is diffeomorphic to the 6-sphere. $\diamond$

Remark. 1. It follows that X_{ab} is *not* not a homogeneous complex manifold—in spite of the fact that all the Y_{ab}'s are. For it readily follows from (4) that its individual complexified tangent spaces $L_{h*}^{-1}(T_hO(\Lambda)^{\mathbb{C}})$ embed differently in $\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ as $h \in O(\Lambda)$ runs over the orbit hence they inherit different infinitesimal complex structures.

2. We will see in Lemma 3.1 that $O(\Lambda^2) = O(\Lambda)$ hence repeating everything with the apparently different twin conjugate orbit $O(\Lambda^2)$ does not yield new complex manifolds. Likewise, Theorem 3.1 will show that in fact all the X_{ab}'s are complex analytically isomorphic to a unique space X.

Before turning to the explicit construction let us examine certain properties of a complex structure on the six-sphere. On the one hand Gray [5] found in 1997 that if X was a hypothetical complex manifold diffeomorphic to S^6 then $H^{0,1}(X) \cong \mathbb{C}$ and raised the question how to interpret the generator of this cohomology group. In addition Ugarte [13, Corollary 3.3] proved in 2000 that either (i) $H^{1,1}(X) \ncong \{0\}$, or (ii) $H^{1,1}(X) \cong \{0\}$ and $H^{0,2}(X) \ncong \{0\}$. Therefore $H^{0,1}(X_{ab}) \cong \mathbb{C}$ moreover either $H^{1,1}(X_{ab}) \ncong \{0\}$, or $H^{1,1}(X_{ab}) \cong \{0\}$ and $H^{0,2}(X_{ab}) \ncong \{0\}$. On the other hand Pittie [10, Proposition 4.5] calculated in 1988 the complete Dolbeault cohomology ring of Y_{ab} and in particular demonstrated that $H^{0,1}(Y_{ab}) \cong \mathbb{C}$, $H^{1,1}(Y_{ab}) \cong \mathbb{C}$ and $H^{0,2}(Y_{ab}) \cong \{0\}$ for all moduli parameters a, b. Now we make a contact between these pieces of data:

Lemma 2.1. *There exists an isomorphism $i^*:H^{0,1}(Y_{ab})\overset{\cong}{\to}H^{0,1}(X_{ab})$ induced by the complex-analytic embedding $i:X_{ab}\to Y_{ab}$. Moreover $H^{1,1}(X_{ab})\ncong\{0\}$ and $i^*:H^{0,2}(Y_{ab})\overset{\cong}{\to}H^{0,2}(X_{ab})$ is an isomorphism too, implying $H^{0,2}(X_{ab})\cong\{0\}$.*

Proof. According to a result [10, Proposition 4.5] the Dolbeault cohomology ring of Y_{ab} is either the pure exterior algebra $\wedge(x^{0,1},y^{1,1},u^{6,5})$ or the mixed algebra $\wedge(x^{0,1},u^{2,1})\otimes_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{C}[y^{1,1}]/((y^{1,1})^6)$ depending on the moduli parameters a,b. This will be used below to obtain the relevant groups $H^{p,q}(Y_{ab})$.

First consider the cohomology in degree 1. Let $0\neq\varphi\in\Omega^{0,1}(Y_{ab})$ be a representative of the generator of $H^{0,1}(Y_{ab})\cong\mathbb{C}$. By the complex-analytic nature of the embedding $i^*\varphi=\varphi|_{X_{ab}}\in\Omega^{0,1}(X_{ab})$ satisfies $\overline{\partial}(\varphi|_{X_{ab}})=(\overline{\partial}\varphi)|_{X_{ab}}=0$ therefore $\varphi|_{X_{ab}}$ descends to a representative of a cohomology class in $H^{0,1}(X_{ab})\cong\mathbb{C}$, too. If $0\neq\psi\in\Omega^{0,1}(X_{ab})$ is a representative of its generator then there exists $c\in\mathbb{C}$ and smooth $f:X_{ab}\to\mathbb{C}$ with the property $\varphi|_{X_{ab}}=c\psi+\overline{\partial}f$. If $c\neq 0$ then the cohomology class of $\varphi|_{X_{ab}}$ in $H^{0,1}(X_{ab})$ is non-trivial yielding that i^* is surjective therefore injective as well hence we are done. Assume that $c=0$. This means that $\varphi|_{X_{ab}}=\overline{\partial}f$ hence $i^*:H^{0,1}(Y_{ab})\to H^{0,1}(X_{ab})$ is the zero map. We proceed now as follows. We already know that $H^{0,1}(X_{ab})\cong\mathbb{C}$ and $H^{0,1}(Y_{ab})\cong\mathbb{C}$ but in addition $H^{0,2}(Y_{ab})\cong\{0\}$. Putting all of these into the relative Dolbeault cohomology exact sequence of the complex-analytic embedding $i:X_{ab}\to Y_{ab}$ we find

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}\ldots\longrightarrow & H^{0,1}(Y_{ab}) & \overset{i^*=0}{\longrightarrow} & H^{0,1}(X_{ab}) & \longrightarrow & H^{0,2}(Y_{ab},X_{ab}) & \longrightarrow & H^{0,2}(Y_{ab}) & \longrightarrow\ldots\\ & \wr\| & & \wr\| & & & & \wr\| & \\ & \mathbb{C} & & \mathbb{C} & & & & \{0\} & \end{array}$$

hence deduce an isomorphism $H^{0,2}(Y_{ab},X_{ab})\cong\mathbb{C}$. This tells us that there exists a $(0,2)$-form ω on Y_{ab} which is $\overline{\partial}$-closed over Y_{ab} and not $\overline{\partial}$-exact over X_{ab}. But the other isomorphism $H^{0,2}(Y_{ab})\cong\{0\}$ also says that ω is both $\overline{\partial}$-closed and $\overline{\partial}$-exact over the whole Y_{ab} hence in particular over X_{ab} leading us to a contradiction. Consequently the assumption that $c=0$ was wrong that is, $i^*:H^{0,1}(Y_{ab})\to H^{0,1}(X_{ab})$ is surjective or injective hence is an isomorphism as stated.

Next consider the cohomology in degree 2. Let $0\neq\omega\in\Omega^{1,1}(Y_{ab})$ be a representative of the generator of $H^{1,1}(Y_{ab})\cong\mathbb{C}$. By the aid of the cohomology ring structure $\frac{1}{7!}\omega\wedge\cdots\wedge\omega$ (7-times) is not in the trivial class in $H^{7,7}(Y_{ab})$; taking a modification $\omega\mapsto\omega+\partial\overline{\partial}f$ if necessary, where $f:Y_{ab}\to\mathbb{C}$ is a smooth function, we can suppose that both $\operatorname{Re}\omega$ and $\operatorname{Im}\omega$ are real positive $(1,1)$-forms. Consequently we can regard $\operatorname{Re}\omega$ as the associated $(1,1)$-form of a Hermitian metric h_{ab} on Y_{ab}. Therefore by Wirtinger's theorem

$$\operatorname{Vol}(X_{ab})=\frac{1}{3!}\int\limits_{X_{ab}}\operatorname{Re}\omega\wedge\operatorname{Re}\omega\wedge\operatorname{Re}\omega>0$$

and the same holds for $\operatorname{Im}\omega$. Hence $\omega|_{X_{ab}}=\operatorname{Re}\omega|_{X_{ab}}+\sqrt{-1}\operatorname{Im}\omega|_{X_{ab}}$ is not in the trivial class demonstrating $H^{1,1}(X_{ab})\ncong\{0\}$.

Finally, collecting information again from the cohomology ring, the following part of the relative Dolbeault cohomology sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}\ldots\longrightarrow & H^{0,2}(Y_{ab}) & \overset{i^*}{\to} & H^{0,2}(X_{ab}) & \longrightarrow & H^{0,3}(Y_{ab},X_{ab}) & \longrightarrow & H^{0,3}(Y_{ab}) & \longrightarrow\ldots\\ & \wr\| & & & & & & \wr\| & \\ & \{0\} & & & & & & \{0\} & \end{array}$$

yields $H^{0,2}(X_{ab})\cong H^{0,3}(Y_{ab},X_{ab})$. But $H^{0,3}(Y_{ab},X_{ab})\cong\{0\}$ because $H^{0,3}(Y_{ab})\cong\{0\}$ as in the considerations in degree 1 above. Therefore, $H^{0,2}(X_{ab})\cong\{0\}$ as stated. $\diamond$

The six-sphere as a complex manifold is not homogeneous in accordance with our previous observations. Consequently blowing it up once in points belonging to different orbits of its automorphism group brings to life spaces which are all diffeomorphic to the complex projective three-space but not complex-analytically isomorphic to each other [6]. LeBrun calls in [8] the existence of such *exotic* $\mathbb{C}P^3$*'s* a "minor disaster". Here we report on a further disaster namely the existence of *exotic* $\mathbb{C}^3$*'s* in a similar sense:

Lemma 2.2. *Let $x_0 \in X_{ab}$ be a point and consider the punctured complex manifold $X^\times_{ab} := X_{ab} \setminus \{x_0\}$. Then the space $X^\times_{ab}$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^3$ but is not complex-analytically isomorphic to it.*

Proof. Obviously $X^\times_{ab}$ is diffeomorphic to $S^6 \setminus \{x_0\}$ i.e., to $\mathbb{R}^6$ like $\mathbb{C}^3$ does. Let $f : X^\times_{ab} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a holomorphic function. By Hartogs' theorem it extends to a holomorphic function $F : X_{ab} \to \mathbb{C}$. However F must be constant [2] consequently f is constant on $X^\times_{ab}$ as well. Since there exists an abundance of non-trivial holomorphic functions on $\mathbb{C}^3$ we conclude that $X^\times_{ab}$ and $\mathbb{C}^3$ are not complex-analytically isomorphic. $\diamond$

3 Explicit construction

The six-sphere as a complex manifold is not easy to grasp. Since X_{ab} is a compact space it cannot be embedded into the affine complex space of any dimension; likewise $H^2(X_{ab};\mathbb{C}) = \{0\}$ shows that it is not Kähler–Hodge consequently it does not admit an embedding into any projective complex space. Therefore its realization as a complex submanifold of some well-known complex manifold fails (we rather would avoid to call the non-Kähler compact 7-manifolds Y_{ab} well-known). Another odd feature is that the algebraic dimension of X_{ab} is zero [2] which means that all global meromorphic functions are constant on it consequently the powerful methods of complex analysis also fail to say anything here. However at least one can seek the almost complex tensor field underlying X_{ab}. Therefore in this section we calculate this integrable almost complex tensor on S^6 explicitly but already warn the reader in advance that the result is so complicated that we decided not to display it. In spite of this we write down carefully the main steps hence the curious (and computer-aided) reader can easily reproduce the calculations and face their quantitative complexity directly.

We begin with an explicit construction of the Samelson family J_{ab} of all the integrable almost complex tensor fields on G_2 as we promised in a footnote of Section 2. We also promised in another footnote there to write down the root basis (2) of the 14 dimensional $\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ explicitly. So let us start with this. Our representation of the basis is the smallest possible one and is provided by the embedding $\mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathfrak{so}(7)^{\mathbb{C}}$ therefere is in terms of 7×7 complex skew symmetric matrices. The corresponding matrices are normed with respect to the Ad-invariant Hermitian scalar product (3) and look as follows:

$$H_{a,\pm b} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{a^2+b^2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mp\sqrt{-1}\,b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \pm\sqrt{-1}\,b & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -a\mp\sqrt{-1}\,b \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a\pm\sqrt{-1}\,b & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } a,b \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } a>0, b\neq 0$$

and one checks that $\{H_{a,\pm b}\}$ span the 2 dimensional complex Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$; moreover

$$V_{\pm 1} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \pm\sqrt{-1} & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \pm\sqrt{-1} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$V_{\pm 2}=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\,0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\,0 & -1 & \pm\sqrt{-1}\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\,0 & \pm\sqrt{-1} & 1\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\,0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\,0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & 0\,0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & -1 & 0\,0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$V_{\pm 3}=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0\,0\,0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0\,0\,0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0\,0\,0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0\,0\,0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \pm\sqrt{-1}\\ 0\,0\,0 & 0 & 0 & \pm\sqrt{-1} & 1\\ 0\,0\,0 & 1 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0\\ 0\,0\,0 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and one checks that $\{H_{a,\pm b}, V_{\pm 1}, V_{\pm 2}, V_{\pm 3}\}$ span the (maximal) subalgebra $\mathfrak{su}(3)^{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$; and finally

$$U_{\pm 1}=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mp 2\sqrt{-1} & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ \pm 2\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \pm\sqrt{-1}\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & -1\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \pm\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$U_{\pm 2}=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \pm 2\sqrt{-1} & 2 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \pm\sqrt{-1}\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & -1\\ \mp 2\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & \pm\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$U_{\pm 3}=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & \mp 2\sqrt{-1}\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \pm\sqrt{-1} & 1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \mp\sqrt{-1} & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & -1 & \pm\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ \pm 2\sqrt{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and one checks that $\{H_{a,+b}, V_{+1}, V_{-2}, V_{-3}, U_{+1}, U_{-2}, U_{+3}\}$ span the (solvable) Samelson subalgebra $\mathfrak{s}_{ab} \subset \mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$; hence the remaining basis vectors $\{H_{a,-b}, V_{-1}, V_{+2}, V_{+3}, U_{-1}, U_{+2}, U_{-3}\}$ form a basis in the complex conjugate subalgebra $\overline{\mathfrak{s}}_{ab} \subset \mathfrak{g}_2^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Consequently picking $a_i + \sqrt{-1}\, b_i \in \mathbb{C}$ to write an element $W \in \mathfrak{s}_{ab}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} W \;:=\; & 2\sqrt{a^2+b^2}(a_0+\sqrt{-1}\,b_0)H_{a,+b}\\ & +2\sqrt{2}(a_4+\sqrt{-1}\,b_4)V_{+1}+2\sqrt{2}(a_5+\sqrt{-1}\,b_5)V_{-2}+2\sqrt{2}(a_6+\sqrt{-1}\,b_6)V_{-3}\\ & +2\sqrt{6}(a_1+\sqrt{-1}\,b_1)U_{+1}+2\sqrt{6}(a_2+\sqrt{-1}\,b_2)U_{-2}+2\sqrt{6}(a_3+\sqrt{-1}\,b_3)U_{+3} \end{aligned}$$

and putting $J_{ab} : \mathfrak{g}_2 \to \mathfrak{g}_2$ to be $J_{ab}(\mathrm{Re}\, W) := -\,\mathrm{Im}\, W$ dictated by the general theory we obtain an $\mathbb{R}$-linear transformation $J_{ab} \in \mathrm{End}\,\mathfrak{g}_2$. Its action on

$$\mathrm{Re}\, W=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2b_1 & -2a_1 & -2b_2 & 2a_2 & 2a_3 & 2b_3\\ -2b_1 & 0 & -aa_0 & -a_4-b_3 & a_3+b_4 & -a_2-a_5 & -b_2-b_5\\ 2a_1 & aa_0 & 0 & a_3-b_4 & -a_4+b_3 & b_2-b_5 & -a_2+a_5\\ 2b_2 & a_4+b_3 & -a_3+b_4 & 0 & bb_0 & -a_1-a_6 & -b_1-b_6\\ -2a_2 & -a_3-b_4 & a_4-b_3 & -bb_0 & 0 & b_1-b_6 & -a_1+a_6\\ -2a_3 & a_2+a_5 & -b_2+b_5 & a_1+a_6 & -b_1+b_6 & 0 & -aa_0+bb_0\\ -2b_3 & b_2+b_5 & a_2-a_5 & b_1+b_6 & a_1-a_6 & aa_0-bb_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is by definition

$$-\operatorname{Im} W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2a_1 & 2b_1 & -2a_2 & -2b_2 & -2b_3 & 2a_3 \\ -2a_1 & 0 & ab_0 & -a_3+b_4 & a_4-b_3 & b_2+b_5 & -a_2-a_5 \\ -2b_1 & -ab_0 & 0 & -a_4-b_3 & a_3+b_4 & a_2-a_5 & b_2-b_5 \\ 2a_2 & a_3-b_4 & a_4+b_3 & 0 & -ba_0 & b_1+b_6 & -a_1-a_6 \\ 2b_2 & -a_4+b_3 & -a_3-b_4 & -ba_0 & 0 & a_1-a_6 & b_1-b_6 \\ 2b_3 & -b_2-b_5 & -a_2+a_5 & -b_1-b_6 & -a_1+a_6 & 0 & ab_0+ba_0 \\ -2a_3 & a_2+a_5 & -b_2+b_5 & a_1+a_6 & -b_1+b_6 & -ab_0-ba_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

hence we immediately check that $J_{ab}^2 = -\operatorname{Id}_{\mathfrak{g}_2}$. The shape of J_{ab} can be read off from these matrices more explicitly if we introduce the real orthonormal basis

$$\begin{aligned} H_+ &:= \frac{\sqrt{a^2+b^2}}{2a}(H_{a,+b}+H_{a,-b}) \\ H_- &:= \frac{\sqrt{a^2+b^2}}{\sqrt{-3}\,b}(H_{a,+b}-H_{a,-b}) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}H_+ \\ X_{\pm k} &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pm 2}}(U_{+k} \pm U_{-k}) \ , \ k=1,2,3 \\ Y_{\pm k} &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pm 2}}(V_{+k} \pm V_{-k}) \ , \ k=1,2,3 \end{aligned}$$

(note that $H_\pm$ are already independent of a,b) on the underlying real Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_2 \subset \mathbb{R}(7)$ equipped with the Ad-invariant real scalar product $\langle V,W\rangle := \operatorname{tr}(V\,W^T)$. A straightforward computation verifies

$$\begin{aligned} J_{ab}H_+ = -\frac{b}{2a}H_+ + \left(\frac{b}{2\sqrt{3}\,a}+\frac{2a}{\sqrt{3}\,b}\right)H_- \quad &, \quad J_{ab}H_- = -\frac{\sqrt{3}\,b}{2a}H_+ + \frac{b}{2a}H_- \\ J_{ab}X_{+k} = X_{-k} \quad &, \quad J_{ab}X_{-k} = -X_{+k} \\ J_{ab}Y_{+k} = Y_{-k} \quad &, \quad J_{ab}Y_{-k} = -Y_{+k} \end{aligned}$$

for all $k=1,2,3$ i.e., J_{ab} is simply blockdiagonal on $\mathfrak{g}_2$ in this frame. Although introducing this basis was natural because it is orthonormal for the Ad-invariant scalar product, the most important complex structures, namely the orthogonal ones, do not show up in it. Therefore we pass to a new basis on $\mathfrak{g}_2$ by applying the $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$-transformation $\begin{pmatrix} h_+ \\ h_- \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{a} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} H_+ \\ H_- \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{a}\,H_- \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}H_+ \end{pmatrix}$ and leaving the other base vectors unaffected. In this new (still orthogonal but not normalized) basis $\{h_\pm, X_{\pm k}, Y_{\pm k}\}$ with $k=1,2,3$ the map J_{ab} takes the slightly modified shape

$$\begin{aligned} J_{ab}\,h_+ = \frac{b}{2a}\,h_+ + \frac{\sqrt{3}\,b}{2}\,h_- \quad &, \quad J_{ab}\,h_- = -\left(\frac{b}{2\sqrt{3}\,a^2}+\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}\,b}\right)h_+ - \frac{b}{2a}\,h_- \\ J_{ab}X_{+k} = X_{-k} \quad &, \quad J_{ab}X_{-k} = -X_{+k} \\ J_{ab}Y_{+k} = Y_{-k} \quad &, \quad J_{ab}Y_{-k} = -Y_{+k} \end{aligned}$$

for all $k=1,2,3$. In this picture we can take the limit $a \to +\infty$ and set $b := \pm\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$ yielding precisely two almost complex structures which are *orthogonal* with respect to the real scalar product on $\mathfrak{g}_2$ i.e., $\langle JV,V\rangle = 0$ and $|JV| = |V|$ for all $V \in \mathfrak{g}_2$. Note the existence of other almost complex structures at $a = +\infty$ with $b \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$. But even more, the parameter a can be extended further down to *negative* reals leading finally to the full moduli space parameterized by $a \in (\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\})\cup\{\infty\}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$. Via the map $(a,b) \mapsto \frac{1}{a}+\sqrt{-1}\,b$ it is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^+ \sqcup \mathbb{C}^-$ as stated in [10, Example on p 123]. This completes the construction of all the integrable almost complex tensors J_{ab} on G_2 *à la* Samelson.

Our next task is to restrict J_{ab} onto the conjugate orbit (1) and then transfer it to S^6. Recall the classical fact that G_2 coincides with the automorphism group of the octonions over the reals; this important fact has not been used so far explicitly. Indeed, we will realize $O(\Lambda)\subset\mathrm{G}_2$ as the subset of inner automorphisms of the octonions. Let $\mathbb{O}$ denote the non-associative, unital normed algebra of the octonions (or Cayley numbers) over the reals. In the canonical oriented basis $\{\mathbf{e}_0,\mathbf{e}_1,\dots,\mathbf{e}_7\}$ the $\mathbf{e}_0$ plays the role of the unit hence $\mathrm{Re}\,\mathbb{O}:=\mathbb{R}\mathbf{e}_0\subset\mathbb{O}$ is the real part. To be absolutely unambiguous we communicate our convention for octonionic multiplication here:

	$\mathbf{e}_0$	$\mathbf{e}_1$	$\mathbf{e}_2$	$\mathbf{e}_3$	$\mathbf{e}_4$	$\mathbf{e}_5$	$\mathbf{e}_6$	$\mathbf{e}_7$
$\mathbf{e}_0$	$\mathbf{e}_0$	$\mathbf{e}_1$	$\mathbf{e}_2$	$\mathbf{e}_3$	$\mathbf{e}_4$	$\mathbf{e}_5$	$\mathbf{e}_6$	$\mathbf{e}_7$
$\mathbf{e}_1$	$\mathbf{e}_1$	$-\mathbf{e}_0$	$\mathbf{e}_3$	$-\mathbf{e}_2$	$\mathbf{e}_5$	$-\mathbf{e}_4$	$-\mathbf{e}_7$	$\mathbf{e}_6$
$\mathbf{e}_2$	$\mathbf{e}_2$	$-\mathbf{e}_3$	$-\mathbf{e}_0$	$\mathbf{e}_1$	$\mathbf{e}_6$	$\mathbf{e}_7$	$-\mathbf{e}_4$	$-\mathbf{e}_5$
$\mathbf{e}_3$	$\mathbf{e}_3$	$\mathbf{e}_2$	$-\mathbf{e}_1$	$-\mathbf{e}_0$	$\mathbf{e}_7$	$-\mathbf{e}_6$	$\mathbf{e}_5$	$-\mathbf{e}_4$
$\mathbf{e}_4$	$\mathbf{e}_4$	$-\mathbf{e}_5$	$-\mathbf{e}_6$	$-\mathbf{e}_7$	$-\mathbf{e}_0$	$\mathbf{e}_1$	$\mathbf{e}_2$	$\mathbf{e}_3$
$\mathbf{e}_5$	$\mathbf{e}_5$	$\mathbf{e}_4$	$-\mathbf{e}_7$	$\mathbf{e}_6$	$-\mathbf{e}_1$	$-\mathbf{e}_0$	$-\mathbf{e}_3$	$\mathbf{e}_2$
$\mathbf{e}_6$	$\mathbf{e}_6$	$\mathbf{e}_7$	$\mathbf{e}_4$	$-\mathbf{e}_5$	$-\mathbf{e}_2$	$\mathbf{e}_3$	$-\mathbf{e}_0$	$-\mathbf{e}_1$
$\mathbf{e}_7$	$\mathbf{e}_7$	$-\mathbf{e}_6$	$\mathbf{e}_5$	$\mathbf{e}_4$	$-\mathbf{e}_3$	$-\mathbf{e}_2$	$\mathbf{e}_1$	$-\mathbf{e}_0$

(actually there are many different conventions in use). The basis above gives rise to a canonical $\mathbb{R}$-linear isomorphism of oriented spaces $(\mathbb{O},\mathbf{e}_0,\dots,\mathbf{e}_7)\cong\mathbb{R}^8$. We can use the standard scalar product on $\mathbb{R}^8$ to define $\mathrm{Im}\,\mathbb{O}:=(\mathrm{Re}\,\mathbb{O})^\perp\subset\mathbb{O}$ and introduce a multiplicative norm $|\cdot|$ on $\mathbb{O}$. Then canonically $(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathbb{O},\mathbf{e}_1,\dots,\mathbf{e}_7)\cong\mathbb{R}^7$ and in this way we can look at the six-sphere as the set of imaginary octonions of unit length i.e., we will suppose $S^6\subset\mathrm{Im}\,\mathbb{O}$. If $u,v\in\mathbb{O}$ and $v\neq 0$ then the identity of elasticity convinces us that $(vu)v^{-1}=v(uv^{-1})$ hence it is meaningful to talk about *inner automorphisms* of the octonions. An important result [7] says that a non-real octonion $v\in\mathbb{O}$ gives rise to an inner automorphism if and only if $4(\mathrm{Re}\,v)^2=|v|^2$ i.e., $3(\mathrm{Re}\,v)^2=|\mathrm{Im}\,v|^2$ holds. Note that this condition implies v^3 is a non-zero scalar therefore it corresponds to the trivial automorphism of $\mathbb{O}$. Picking an $x\in S^6$ the non-real octonion $v:=\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,x$ satisfying $v^3=-8\mathbf{e}_0$ gives rise to an inner automorphism (parantheses can be omitted)

$$u\longmapsto(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,x)u(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,x)^{-1}=\frac{1}{4}(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,x)u(\mathbf{e}_0-\sqrt{3}\,x) \tag{5}$$

and all inner automorphisms of the octonions are of this form. In this way we get a remarkable map

$$f:S^6\longrightarrow\mathrm{G}_2\ . \tag{6}$$

Knowing that $\mathrm{Re}\,\mathbb{O}$ is invariant under all automorphisms and that the corresponding reduced linear map of $\mathrm{Im}\,\mathbb{O}$ is an orientation preserving orthogonal transformation of $\mathbb{R}^7$ we can embed G_2 into $\mathrm{SO}(7)$. Under the canonical isomorphism $(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathbb{O},\mathbf{e}_1,\dots,\mathbf{e}_7)\cong\mathbb{R}^7$ we put $x=x_1\mathbf{e}_1+\dots+x_7\mathbf{e}_7$ and the image $f(x)$ of the map (6) at x takes the shape

$$f\begin{pmatrix}x_1\\x_2\\x_3\\x_4\\x_5\\x_6\\x_7\end{pmatrix}=\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\begin{pmatrix}
-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}+\sqrt{3}x_1^2 & -x_3+\sqrt{3}x_1x_2 & x_2+\sqrt{3}x_1x_3 & -x_5+\sqrt{3}x_1x_4 & x_4+\sqrt{3}x_1x_5 & x_7+\sqrt{3}x_1x_6 & -x_6+\sqrt{3}x_1x_7\\
x_3+\sqrt{3}x_2x_1 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}+\sqrt{3}x_2^2 & -x_1+\sqrt{3}x_2x_3 & -x_6+\sqrt{3}x_2x_4 & -x_7+\sqrt{3}x_2x_5 & x_4+\sqrt{3}x_2x_6 & x_5+\sqrt{3}x_2x_7\\
-x_2+\sqrt{3}x_3x_1 & x_1+\sqrt{3}x_3x_2 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}+\sqrt{3}x_3^2 & -x_7+\sqrt{3}x_3x_4 & x_6+\sqrt{3}x_3x_5 & -x_5+\sqrt{3}x_3x_6 & x_4+\sqrt{3}x_3x_7\\
x_5+\sqrt{3}x_4x_1 & x_6+\sqrt{3}x_4x_2 & x_7+\sqrt{3}x_4x_3 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}+\sqrt{3}x_4^2 & -x_1+\sqrt{3}x_4x_5 & -x_2+\sqrt{3}x_4x_6 & -x_3+\sqrt{3}x_4x_7\\
-x_4+\sqrt{3}x_5x_1 & x_7+\sqrt{3}x_5x_2 & -x_6+\sqrt{3}x_5x_3 & x_1+\sqrt{3}x_5x_4 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}+\sqrt{3}x_5^2 & x_3+\sqrt{3}x_5x_6 & -x_2+\sqrt{3}x_5x_7\\
-x_7+\sqrt{3}x_6x_1 & -x_4+\sqrt{3}x_6x_2 & x_5+\sqrt{3}x_6x_3 & x_2+\sqrt{3}x_6x_4 & -x_3+\sqrt{3}x_6x_5 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}+\sqrt{3}x_6^2 & x_1+\sqrt{3}x_6x_7\\
x_6+\sqrt{3}x_7x_1 & -x_5+\sqrt{3}x_7x_2 & -x_4+\sqrt{3}x_7x_3 & x_3+\sqrt{3}x_7x_4 & x_2+\sqrt{3}x_7x_5 & -x_1+\sqrt{3}x_7x_6 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}+\sqrt{3}x_7^2
\end{pmatrix}$$

of a 7×7 special orthogonal matrix with $x_1,\dots,x_7\in\mathbb{R}$ satisfying $x_1^2+\dots+x_7^2=1$. It readily follows from (5) or by a direct computation that $f(x)^3=\mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^7}$ and $f(x)x=x$ i.e., $R_x:=f(x)$ is a degree $\frac{2\pi}{3}$ rotation about the axis through $x\in\mathbb{R}^7$. Likewise, since $\Lambda\in Z(\mathrm{SU}(3))\cong\mathbb{Z}_3$ satisfies $\Lambda^3=e\in\mathrm{G}_2$ it is also true that $h^3=e$ for all $h\in O(\Lambda)$. In fact the two subsets $f(S^6)$ and $O(\Lambda)$ of G_2 are nothing but the same (cf. [3, pp 160-161]):

Lemma 3.1. *The conjugate orbit $O(\Lambda)\subset\mathrm{G}_2$ of (1) and the image $f(S^6)\subset\mathrm{G}_2$ of the map (6) coincide as subsets within G_2 i.e., $O(\Lambda)=f(S^6)$. Moreover $O(\Lambda)=O(\Lambda^2)$, where $O(\Lambda^2)=\{g\Lambda^2g^{-1}|g\in\mathrm{G}_2\}$ is the conjugate orbit passing through the square of the generator $\Lambda^2\in Z(\mathrm{SU}(3))\subset\mathrm{G}_2$.*

Proof. We quickly observe $f(\mathbf{e}_1)=\Lambda\in Z(\mathrm{SU}(3))\subset\mathrm{G}_2$. Therefore the action $u\mapsto\Lambda u$ on $u\in\mathbb{O}$ arises from the inner automorphism $u\mapsto(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,\mathbf{e}_1)u(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,\mathbf{e}_1)^{-1}$ in (5). Now pick $g\in\mathrm{G}_2$ then the twisted action $u\mapsto(g\Lambda g^{-1})u$ looks like

$$\begin{aligned}(g\Lambda g^{-1})u &= g\Big((\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,\mathbf{e}_1)(g^{-1}u)(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,\mathbf{e}_1)^{-1}\Big)=-\frac{1}{8}\,g\Big((\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,\mathbf{e}_1)(g^{-1}u)(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,\mathbf{e}_1)^2\Big)\\ &= -\frac{1}{8}\,g(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,\mathbf{e}_1)u(g(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,\mathbf{e}_1))^2=-\frac{1}{8}(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}(g\mathbf{e}_1))u(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}(g\mathbf{e}_1))^2\\ &= (\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}(g\mathbf{e}_1))u(\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}(g\mathbf{e}_1))^{-1}\end{aligned}$$

consequently it stems from an inner automorphism by $v:=\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}(g\mathbf{e}_1)$. Therefore $f(g\mathbf{e}_1)=g\Lambda g^{-1}$ and taking into account that G_2 acts transitively on $S^6\subset\mathrm{Im}\,\mathbb{O}$ (with stabilizer subgroup $\mathrm{SU}(3)\subset\mathrm{G}_2$) we conclude that $f(S^6)=O(\Lambda)$.

The fact $f(-x)=f(x)^T=f(x)^{-1}$ gives the identity $f(\pm x)=f(x)^{\pm1}$ for all $x\in S^6$. Therefore $f(\pm\mathbf{e}_1)=f(\mathbf{e}_1)^{\pm1}=\Lambda^{\pm1}$ yielding $f(-\mathbf{e}_1)=\Lambda^{-1}=\Lambda^2$. Taking an element $g\in\mathrm{G}_2$ (unique up to multiplication from the right from $\mathrm{SU}(3)\subset\mathrm{G}_2$) satisfying $g\mathbf{e}_1=-\mathbf{e}_1$ we can write $\Lambda^2=g\Lambda g^{-1}$; hence the two conjugate orbits of Λ and Λ^2 in G_2 are not distinct consequently they must coincide. $\diamond$

Let $f(x)_*:T_xS^6\to T_{f(x)}\mathrm{G}_2$ be the derivative (linear) map of (6) at $x\in S^6$, $\xi\in T_xS^6$ a tangent vector and $f(x)_*\xi\in T_{f(x)}\mathrm{G}_2$ its image. Exploiting the equality $f(S^6)=O(\Lambda)\subset\mathrm{G}_2$ of Lemma 3.1 we can more accurately write $f(x)_*\xi\in T_{f(x)}O(\Lambda)\subset T_{f(x)}\mathrm{G}_2$. Putting $\xi=\xi_1\mathbf{e}_1+\dots+\xi_7\mathbf{e}_7$ it follows that

$$f(x)_*\begin{pmatrix}\xi_1\\ \xi_2\\ \xi_3\\ \xi_4\\ \xi_5\\ \xi_6\\ \xi_7\end{pmatrix}=\frac{3}{2}\begin{pmatrix}
2x_1\xi_1 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_3+x_1\xi_2+x_2\xi_1 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_2+x_1\xi_3+x_3\xi_1 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_5+x_1\xi_4+x_4\xi_1 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_4+x_1\xi_5+x_5\xi_1\\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_3+x_2\xi_1+x_1\xi_2 & 2x_2\xi_2 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_1+x_2\xi_3+x_3\xi_2 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_6+x_2\xi_4+x_4\xi_2 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_7+x_2\xi_5+x_5\xi_2\\
-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_2+x_3\xi_1+x_1\xi_3 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_1+x_3\xi_2+x_2\xi_3 & 2x_3\xi_3 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_7+x_3\xi_4+x_4\xi_3 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_6+x_3\xi_5+x_5\xi_3\\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_5+x_4\xi_1+x_1\xi_4 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_6+x_4\xi_2+x_2\xi_4 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_7+x_4\xi_3+x_3\xi_4 & 2x_4\xi_4 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_1+x_4\xi_5+x_5\xi_4\\
-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_4+x_5\xi_1+x_1\xi_5 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_7+x_5\xi_2+x_2\xi_5 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_6+x_5\xi_3+x_3\xi_5 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_1+x_5\xi_4+x_4\xi_5 & 2x_5\xi_5\\
-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_7+x_6\xi_1+x_1\xi_6 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_4+x_6\xi_2+x_2\xi_6 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_5+x_6\xi_3+x_3\xi_6 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_2+x_6\xi_4+x_4\xi_6 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_3+x_6\xi_5+x_5\xi_6\\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_6+x_7\xi_1+x_1\xi_7 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_6+x_7\xi_2+x_2\xi_7 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_4+x_7\xi_3+x_3\xi_7 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_3+x_7\xi_4+x_4\xi_7 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_2+x_7\xi_5+x_5\xi_7
\end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_7+x_1\xi_6+x_6\xi_1 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_6+x_1\xi_7+x_7\xi_1\\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_4+x_2\xi_6+x_6\xi_2 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_5+x_2\xi_7+x_7\xi_2\\
-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_5+x_3\xi_6+x_6\xi_3 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_4+x_3\xi_7+x_7\xi_3\\
-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_2+x_4\xi_6+x_6\xi_4 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_3+x_4\xi_7+x_7\xi_4\\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_3+x_5\xi_6+x_6\xi_5 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_2+x_5\xi_7+x_7\xi_5\\
2x_6\xi_6 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_1+x_6\xi_7+x_7\xi_6\\
-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\xi_1+x_7\xi_6+x_6\xi_7 & 2x_7\xi_7
\end{pmatrix}$$

out of which we compute (but already unable to plot) $L^{-1}_{f(x)*}(f(x)_*\xi)\in L^{-1}_{f(x)*}(T_{f(x)}O(\Lambda))\subset T_e\mathrm{G}_2=\mathfrak{g}_2$. In less fancy notation this is equal to the matrix product $f(x)^{-1}(f(x)_*\xi)\in\mathbb{R}(7)$. Given $\xi,\eta\in T_xS^6$ it is possible to compare their standard scalar product $\langle\xi,\eta\rangle_x$ within $\mathbb{R}^7$ and that of their images in $\mathfrak{g}_2$ equipped with its Ad-invariant real scalar product. An elementary but exhausting computation yields

$$\big\langle f(x)^{-1}(f(x)_*\xi)\,,\,f(x)^{-1}(f(x)_*\eta)\big\rangle=9\langle\xi,\eta\rangle_x\ .$$

Consequently if $\{\dots,\xi,\dots,\eta,\dots\}$ is any orthonormal oriented basis in T_xS^6 then an induced orthonormal frame is $\big\{\dots,\frac{1}{3}f(x)^{-1}(f(x)_*\xi),\dots,\frac{1}{3}f(x)^{-1}(f(x)_*\eta),\dots\big\}$ within the real 6 dimensional subspace $L^{-1}_{f(x)*}(T_{f(x)}O(\Lambda))\subset\mathfrak{g}_2$. In this basis the off-diagonal and the diagonal matrix elements of the restriction $J_{ab}|_{O(\Lambda)}$, after left-translating to $\mathfrak{g}_2$, have the form

$$\frac{1}{9}\langle J_{ab}\left(f^{-1}(x)(f(x)_*\xi)\right)\,,\,f(x)^{-1}(f(x)_*\eta)\rangle\ ,\ \frac{1}{9}\langle J_{ab}\left(f^{-1}(x)(f(x)_*\xi)\right)\,,\,f(x)^{-1}(f(x)_*\xi)\rangle$$

respectively. These matrix elements of $J_{ab}|_{O(\Lambda)}$ will not be constructed here.

Rather let us seek a matrix representation of the induced almost complex structure on S^6 itself. For simplicity we continue to denote by J_{ab} the almost complex tensor field on S^6. Then a typical off-diagonal matrix element of $J_{ab}|_x:T_xS^6\to T_xS^6$ looks like

$$\langle J_{ab}\xi,\eta\rangle_x=\left\langle\left(\frac{1}{3}f(x)^{-1}f(x)_*\right)^{-1}\left(J_{ab}\left(\frac{1}{3}f(x)^{-1}(f(x)_*\xi)\right)\right)\,,\,\eta\right\rangle_x=\langle f(x)_*^{-1}\left(J_{ab}(f(x)_*\xi)\right)\,,\,\eta\rangle_x$$

where the translation invariance $f(x)J_{ab}f(x)^{-1}=J_{ab}$ of the Samelson almost complex tensor on G_2 was used moreover $f(x)_*^{-1}:T_{f(x)}O(\Lambda)\to T_xS^6$ is the inverse of $f(x)_*:T_xS^6\to T_{f(x)}O(\Lambda)$. The easiest way to get it is to take a curve $x(t)=x+t\xi+\dots$ on S^6 and differentiate the eigenvalue equation $f(x(t))x(t)=x(t)$ with respect to $t\in\mathbb{R}$. The t-linear term yields the identity $f(x)\xi+(f(x)_*\xi)\,x=\xi$ consequently with any $A\in T_{f(x)}O(\Lambda)$ we obtain a formal expression $f(x)_*^{-1}A=\big((\mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^7}-f(x))^{-1}A\big)\,x$ for the inverse. Actually this expression is indeed formal only because the matrix $\mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^7}-f(x)$ is not invertible. To overcome this difficulty pick $s\in\mathbb{R}$, denote $s\cdot\mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^7}$ simply by $s_{\mathbb{R}^7}$ and calculate the inverse $f(x)_*^{-1}:T_{f(x)}O(\Lambda)\to T_xS^6$ by a regularization: for any $A\in T_{f(x)}O(\Lambda)$ put

$$f(x)_*^{-1}A:=\lim_{s\to1}\big((s_{\mathbb{R}^7}-f(x))^{-1}A\big)\,x\ .$$

This formula is meaningful if we understand that $x\in S^6\subset\mathbb{R}^7$ is a vector acted upon by the matrices $A\in\mathbb{R}(7)$ and then by $(s_{\mathbb{R}^7}-f(x))^{-1}\in\mathbb{R}(7)$ with $s\neq1$. Moreover it satisfies $f(x)_*^{-1}\left(f(x)_*\xi\right)=\xi$ for all $x\in S^6$ and $\xi\in T_xS^6$ as well as $f(x)_*(f(x)_*^{-1}A)=A$ for all $A\in T_{f(x)}O(\Lambda)$ therefore as the inverse works well. A direct computation making use of all the orthogonality relations

$$\begin{cases}x_1^2+\dots+x_7^2 & =1\\ \xi_1^2+\dots+\xi_7^2 & =1\\ \eta_1^2+\dots+\eta_7^2 & =1\\ x_1\xi_1+\dots+x_7\xi_7 & =0\\ x_1\eta_1+\dots+x_7\eta_7 & =0\\ \xi_1\eta_1+\dots+\xi_7\eta_7 & =0\end{cases}$$

obeyed by $\xi,\eta\in T_xS^6$ as vectors in $\mathbb{R}^7$ shows that a typical off-diagonal matrix element $\langle J_{ab}\xi,\eta\rangle_x$ looks like

$$\sum_{1\leqq i,j\leqq7}P_{ab,ij}(x_1,\dots,x_7)\xi_i\eta_j \tag{7}$$

where $P_{ab,ij} : S^6 \to \mathbb{R}$ with $i,j = 1,\dots,7$ are as many as 49 explicitly given real non-homogeneous quartic polynomials. It turns out that $P_{ab,77} = 0$ but otherwise they are highly non-trivial.[3] The longest polynomials contain approximately 60, possibly even constant, terms. Therefore a typical off-diagonal element of $J_{ab}|_x : T_xS^6 \to T_xS^6$ in a generic basis is built up from about 2500 at most quartic monomials. In the same fashion the diagonal entries are

$$\langle J_{ab}\xi,\xi\rangle_x = \langle f(x)_*^{-1}\left(J_{ab}(f(x)_*\xi)\right),\xi\rangle_x$$

and these $\langle J_{ab}\xi,\xi\rangle_x$ take the shape

$$Q_{ab}(x_1,\dots,x_7) + \sum_{1\leqq i\leqq j\leqq 7} Q_{ab,ij}(x_1,\dots,x_7)\xi_i\xi_j \tag{8}$$

where $Q_{ab}, Q_{ab,ij} : S^6 \to \mathbb{R}$ with $i = 1,\dots,7$ and $j = i,\dots,7$ are further $1+28 = 29$ explicitly given real non-homogeneous quartic polynomials. Again $Q_{ab,77} = 0$ but otherwise they are not identically zero.[4] The complete tensor J_{ab} over $x \in S^6$ in the generic orthonormal frame is therefore a 6×6 real matrix consisting of roughly 8.5×10^4 at most sextic monomial terms in the 21 variables x_i,ξ_j,η_k with $i,j,k = 1,\dots,7$. It is not an exaggeration to say that this matrix is out of control at this stage yet.

Instead of struggling with an infinitesimal *generic* gauge we may try to write J_{ab} down in some local *specific* gauge S^6. This means that we wish to express the orthonormal vectors $\xi,\eta \in T_yS^6$ in the matrix elements $\langle J_{ab}\xi,\eta\rangle_y$ and $\langle J_{ab}\xi,\xi\rangle_y$ as locally smooth functions of $y \in S^6$ alone; hence $J_{ab}|_y : T_yS^6 \to T_yS^6$ will depend only on $y_1,\dots,y_7$ in this gauge as it should be. Introduce the 7×7 special orthogonal matrix

$$B_y = B_y(\dots,\xi,\dots,\eta,\dots) := \begin{pmatrix} y_1 & \dots & \xi_1 & \dots & \eta_1 & \dots \\ y_2 & \dots & \xi_2 & \dots & \eta_2 & \dots \\ y_3 & \dots & \xi_3 & \dots & \eta_3 & \dots \\ y_4 & \dots & \xi_4 & \dots & \eta_4 & \dots \\ y_5 & \dots & \xi_5 & \dots & \eta_5 & \dots \\ y_6 & \dots & \xi_6 & \dots & \eta_6 & \dots \\ y_7 & \dots & \xi_7 & \dots & \eta_7 & \dots \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$

in order to denote an oriented orthonormal frame in $T_yS^6 \subset \mathbb{R}^7$ in a compact form. Additionally, recall the well-known $\mathrm{SU}(3)$-fibration $\pi_1 : \mathrm{G}_2 \to S^6$ via projection onto the 1^{st} column of a $\mathrm{G}_2 \subset \mathrm{SO}(7)$ matrix. This projection combined with (6) gives rise to an algebraic map $\pi_1\circ f : S^6 \to S^6$ of the form

$$\pi_1\left(f\begin{pmatrix}x_1\\x_2\\x_3\\x_4\\x_5\\x_6\\x_7\end{pmatrix}\right) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}+\sqrt{3}x_1^2 \\ x_3+\sqrt{3}x_2x_1 \\ -x_2+\sqrt{3}x_3x_1 \\ x_5+\sqrt{3}x_4x_1 \\ -x_4+\sqrt{3}x_5x_1 \\ -x_7+\sqrt{3}x_6x_1 \\ x_6+\sqrt{3}x_7x_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

hence is easily seen to be onto the closure of the contractible open subset $U_1 \subset S^6$ where we put

$$U_i := \left\{ y\in S^6 \;\middle|\; -1\leqq y_1\leqq +1,\dots,-\frac{1}{2} < y_i \leqq +1,\dots,-1\leqq y_7\leqq +1 \right\}\ ,\ i = 1,\dots,7\ .$$

[3] Precisely which $P_{ab,ij}$ vanishes of course depends on the way how the orthogonality relations above are used to perform simplifications.

[4] The extra polynomial Q_{ab} appears because the diagonal entries contain terms independent of ξ since the orthogonality condition $\xi_1^2+\dots+\xi_7^2 = 1$ holds. Moreover like in the case of the $P_{ab,ij}$'s the $Q_{ab,77} = 0$ is the result of the particular way of using the orthogonality relations to carry out simplifications.

Taking into account that (9) is an SO(7) matrix and $\pi_1^{-1}(y)\cap f(S^6)\subset \mathrm{G}_2\subset \mathrm{SO}(7)$ we specialize B_y further by demanding

$$B_y\in\pi_1^{-1}(y)\cap f(S^6)\quad\text{if}\quad y\in U_1\ .$$

Actually $\pi_1^{-1}(y)\cap f(S^6)$ consists of precisely two matrices therefore we choose $B_y(\dots,\xi,\dots,\eta,\dots)$ to belong to one branch hence ξ,η, etc. depend smoothly on $y\in U_1$. After solving $\pi_1(f(x))=y$ for x we take for example

$$\begin{cases} x_1 = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{2y_1+1}\\ x_2 = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}(y_1+1)}\left(\sqrt{2y_1+1}\,y_2-y_3\right)\\ x_3 = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}(y_1+1)}\left(y_2+\sqrt{2y_1+1}\,y_3\right)\\ x_4 = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}(y_1+1)}\left(\sqrt{2y_1+1}\,y_4-y_5\right)\\ x_5 = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}(y_1+1)}\left(y_4+\sqrt{2y_1+1}\,y_5\right)\\ x_6 = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}(y_1+1)}\left(\sqrt{2y_1+1}\,y_6+y_7\right)\\ x_7 = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}(y_1+1)}\left(-y_7+\sqrt{2y_1+1}\,y_6\right)\ . \end{cases}$$

Obviously B_y with $y\in U_1$ arises by plugging x_k's above into the matrix $f(x)$ of (6). We see that in the first column of $f(x)$ the x_k's are indeed replaced by y_k's and if ξ is the i^{th} basis vector of T_yS^6 with ξ_j its j^{th} component in B_y then certainly $\xi_j(y_1,\dots,y_7)=(B_y)_{j,i+1}$ in the choosen gauge. In a similar way we get $\eta_k(y_1,\dots,y_7)$. On the one hand these are already quite complicated expressios; for instance if ξ is put to be the first basis vector in (9) i.e., is identified with the 2^{nd} column of B_y then its 3^{rd} component ξ_3 is $(B_y)_{32}$ and looks like

$$\xi_3(y_1,\dots,y_7)=\frac{1}{y_1^2+2y_1+1}\left(y_1y_2y_3+\frac{\sqrt{2y_1+1}}{2}\left(y_1^2+y_2^2-y_3^2+2y_1+1\right)\right)\ ,\ y_1>-\frac{1}{2}\ .$$

But on the other hand beyond the standard orthogonality relations for y_i,ξ_j,η_k the equality $B_y^3=\mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^7}$ yields further highly non-trivial identities among them valid only in this special gauge. Inserting these into the off-diagonal matrix elements (7) one gets

$$\langle J_{ab}\xi,\eta\rangle_y=\sum_{1\leqq i,j\leqq 7}P_{ab,ij}(y_1,\dots,y_7)\xi_i(y_1,\dots,y_7)\eta_j(y_1,\dots,y_7)$$

and into the diagonal ones (8) one obtains

$$\langle J_{ab}\xi,\xi\rangle_y=Q_{ab}(y_1,\dots,y_7)+\sum_{1\leqq i\leqq j\leqq 7}Q_{ab,ij}(y_1,\dots,y_7)\xi_i(y_1,\dots,y_7)\xi_j(y_1,\dots,y_7)$$

respectively and in this way one comes up with the full matrix $J_{ab}|_y:T_yS^6\to T_yS^6$ if $y\in U_1$. Of course one can do these substitutions however the size of the resulting 6×6 matrix function over U_1 remains embarrassing. Finally, a collection of local gauges of this kind covering the whole S^6 arises as follows. Fix an index $i\in\{1,\dots,7\}$ and re-arrange (9) by putting the column of the y_k's to be the i^{th} one. Likewise, consider the analogously defined further maps $\pi_i\circ f:S^6\to S^6$ projecting onto the i^{th} column hence mapping S^6 onto the closures of the other open subsets $U_i\subset S^6$ with $i=1,\dots,7$. Although the individual maps $\pi_i\circ f$ are not surjective it follows from the fact $7(-\frac{1}{2})^2>1$ that $\{U_1,\dots,U_7\}$ comprises an open covering of S^6.

Despite its complexity, evaluation at a specific point allows us to gain a comprehensable view of J_{ab} over $U_1\subset S^6$. Consider the north pole $y:=\mathbf{e}_1\in U_1$ with coordinates $y_1=1,y_2=0,\dots,y_7=0$ and

use our specific gauge

$$B_{\mathbf{e}_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

to identify $T_{\mathbf{e}_1}S^6$ with $\mathbb{R}^6$. Then a direct substitution $y = \mathbf{e}_1$ into the 36 matrix elements $\langle J_{ab}\xi, \eta\rangle_y$ and $\langle J_{ab}\xi, \xi\rangle_y$ found above shows that $J_{\mathbf{e}_1} := J_{ab}|_{\mathbf{e}_1} : T_{\mathbf{e}_1}S^6 \to T_{\mathbf{e}_1}S^6$ takes a very simple form

$$J_{\mathbf{e}_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

consequently in this (and in fact, all) basis over $\mathbf{e}_1 \in U_1$ it simply coincides with the standard almost complex structure on $\mathbb{R}^6$ and in particular is independent of the moduli parameters a, b. Recalling Lemma 3.1 there exists an element $g_y \in \mathrm{G}_2$, unique up to multiplication from the right by an element of $\mathrm{SU}(3) \subset \mathrm{G}_2$, such that $y \in U_1 \subset S^6$ can be written as $y = g_y\mathbf{e}_1$ and $f(y) = f(g_y\mathbf{e}_1) = g_y\Lambda g_y^{-1}$. Then consider the intertwining linear isomorphism defined through the chain of maps

$$\Theta_{y_2,y_1} : \; T_{y_1}S^6 \xrightarrow{f(y_1)_*} T_{f(y_1)}O(\Lambda) \xrightarrow{L^{-1}_{f(y_1)*}} \mathfrak{g}_2 \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Ad}_{g_{y_2}g_{y_1}^{-1}}} \mathfrak{g}_2 \xrightarrow{L_{f(y_2)*}} T_{f(y_2)}O(\Lambda) \xrightarrow{f(y_2)^{-1}_*} T_{y_2}S^6 \; .$$

Its inverse $\Theta^{-1}_{y_2,y_1} : T_{y_2}S^6 \to T_{y_1}S^6$ saitsfies $\Theta^{-1}_{y_2,y_1} = \Theta_{y_1,y_2}$ hence in particular $\Theta_{y,y} = \mathrm{Id}_{T_yS^6}$. The composition rule $\Theta_{y_2,y}\Theta_{y,y_1} = \Theta_{y_2,y_1}$ also holds. Note moreover that in order to get the actual matrix representation of $\Theta_{y_2,y_1} : T_{y_1}S^6 \to T_{y_2}S^6$ we have to identify the tangent spaces with $\mathbb{R}^6$ using the frame (9) corresponding to our gauge choice: if $y_1, y_2 \in U_1$ one has to use B_{y_1} on $T_{y_1}S^6$ as well as B_{y_2} on $T_{y_2}S^6$. Therefore specializing to $y_1 := \mathbf{e}_1 \in U_1$ and $y_2 := y \in U_1$ and taking $\xi \in T_{\mathbf{e}_1}S^6$ i.e., ξ is a (not first) column of $B_{\mathbf{e}_1}$ and $\eta \in T_yS^6$ i.e., η is a (not first) column of B_y, the matrix coefficients of $\Theta_{y,\mathbf{e}_1}$ are computed as

$$\langle \Theta_{y,\mathbf{e}_1}\xi \, , \, \eta\rangle_y = \left\langle \lim_{s\to 1}\Big((s_{\mathbb{R}^7} - f(y))^{-1} f(y)\,\mathrm{Ad}_{g_y g_{\mathbf{e}_1}^{-1}}\, f(\mathbf{e}_1)^{-1} f(\mathbf{e}_1)_*\xi\Big)\, y \, , \, \eta \right\rangle_y \; .$$

Taking into account (4) it follows that $J_y := J_{ab}|_y : T_yS^6 \to T_yS^6$ with $y \in U_1$ factorizes as

$$J_y = \Theta_{y,\mathbf{e}_1} J_{\mathbf{e}_1} \Theta^{-1}_{y,\mathbf{e}_1}$$

that is, the almost complex tensor J_{ab} continues to be independent of the moduli parameters over the whole open set $U_1 \subset S^6$. Similar computations provide us with the shape of the almost complex tensor over the other members $U_2, \ldots, U_7 \subset S^6$ of the open cover. As an important by-product we obtain

Theorem 3.1. *All the complex manifolds $X_{ab} \subset Y_{ab}$ of Theorem 2.1 coming from restricting the Samelson complex structures of G_2 onto its conjugate orbit are complex analytically isomorphic. Consequently there exists at least one compact complex 3-manifold X diffeomorphic to S^6.*

This uniqueness result is in agreement with the conclusion of [4] obtained by different means.

4 Appendix: inner automorphisms and $\pi_6(\mathrm{G}_2)\cong\mathbb{Z}_3$

To close we take a look of the conjugate orbit $O(\Lambda)\subset\mathrm{G}_2$ in (1) from a topological viewpoint. As we have seen in Lemma 3.1 it can be identified with the image of the map $f:S^6\to\mathrm{G}_2$ in (6); we demonstrate that in this form the conjugate orbit represents the generator of the sixth homotopy group of the automorphism group of the octonions. Consequently this homotopy group is non-trivial and is generated by inner automorphisms. We acknowledge that this group has been known for a long time [9, 3] and even our proof is essentially the same as that in [3]. Nevertheless we re-present it here just for completeness and fun.

Theorem 4.1. *There exists an isomorphism $\pi_6(\mathrm{G}_2)\cong\mathbb{Z}_3$. Moreover the map (6) constructed out of the collection of rotations induced by inner automorphisms (5) of the octonions, is a representative of the generator of this homotopy group.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathrm{Spin}(7)\subset\mathrm{Cliff}_0(\mathbb{R}^7)\cong\mathrm{Cliff}(\mathbb{R}^6)\cong\mathbb{R}(8)$ hence the unique spin representation of $\mathrm{SO}(7)$ acts on $\mathbb{R}^8$. This gives rise to an embedding $\mathrm{Spin}(7)\subset\mathrm{SO}(8)$. The projection $P:\mathrm{SO}(8)\to S^7$ sending a matrix onto its (let us say) first column restricts to $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ providing us with a projection $\tilde{p}:\mathrm{Spin}(7)\to S^7$. Dividing this with the center $\mathbb{Z}_2\cong Z(\mathrm{SO}(8))\subset\mathrm{SO}(8)$ we obtain another projection $p:\mathrm{SO}(7)\to\mathbb{R}P^7$. The geometric meaning of this map is straightforward: the preimage of a point of $\mathbb{R}P^7$ i.e., a line in $\mathbb{R}^8$ consists of those rotations which keep this line fixed therefore act only on a hyperplane perpendicular to this line: dimension counting shows that these transformations are exactly the automorphisms of the octonions hence their collection is isomorphic to G_2. Consequently the projection $p:\mathrm{SO}(7)\to\mathbb{R}P^7$ is the classical G_2-fibration of $\mathrm{SO}(7)$ over $\mathbb{R}P^7$. It has an associated homotopy exact sequence whose relevant segment now is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & & & \pi_7(\mathrm{SO}(7),\mathrm{G}_2,e) & & & & \\
 & & & \overset{j_*}{\nearrow} & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle p_*}\cong & \overset{\partial_*}{\searrow} & & & \\
\ldots & \longrightarrow & \pi_7(\mathrm{SO}(7),e) & & \pi_7(\mathbb{R}P^7,p(e)) & & \pi_6(\mathrm{G}_2,e) & \longrightarrow & \pi_6(\mathrm{SO}(7),e)\longrightarrow\ldots
\end{array}$$

where $j:(\mathrm{SO}(7),e,e)\to(\mathrm{SO}(7),\mathrm{G}_2,e)$ is induced by the embedding $e\in\mathrm{G}_2\subset\mathrm{SO}(7)$.

First let us compute $\pi_6(\mathrm{G}_2)$. Take $S^7=\{2\cos t\cdot\mathbf{e}_0+2\sin t\cdot x\,|\,0\leqq t\leqq\pi\,,\,x\in S^6\}$. The conjugation (5) can be enhanced to an orthogonal transformation of the octonions which on a particular $u\in\mathbb{O}$ has the form (again parantheses omitted)

$$u\mapsto(2\cos t\cdot\mathbf{e}_0+2\sin t\cdot x)u(2\cos t\cdot\mathbf{e}_0+2\sin t\cdot x)^{-1}=(\cos t\cdot\mathbf{e}_0+\sin t\cdot x)u(\cos t\cdot\mathbf{e}_0-\sin t\cdot x)\quad(10)$$

and provides us with a map from S^7 into $\mathrm{SO}(8)$. However this apparent $\mathrm{SO}(8)$ transformation of $\mathbb{O}\cong\mathbb{R}^8$ leaves $\mathrm{Re}\,\mathbb{O}\cong\mathbb{R}$ invariant i.e., acts only on $\mathrm{Im}\,\mathbb{O}\cong\mathbb{R}^7$ therefore it is actually an $\mathrm{SO}(7)$ transformation. This way we obtain a map $F:S^7\to\mathrm{SO}(7)$ such that $[F]=1\in\pi_7(\mathrm{SO}(7))\cong\mathbb{Z}$ i.e., its homotopy class is a generator [12]. Take now the 7-cell $e^7:=\{2\cos t\cdot\mathbf{e}_0+2\sin t\cdot x\,|\,0\leqq t\leqq\frac{\pi}{3}\,,\,x\in S^6\}\subset S^7$. Its boundary is $\partial e^7=\{\mathbf{e}_0+\sqrt{3}\,x\,|\,x\in S^6\}$ hence constitutes the inner automorphisms (5) of the octonions therefore via (10) it lies within $\mathrm{G}_2\subset\mathrm{SO}(7)$. Consequently restriction to this 7-cell gives rise to a map $F|_{e^7}:(e^7,\partial e^7)\to(\mathrm{SO}(7),\mathrm{G}_2)$ satisfying $[F|_{e^7}]=1\in\pi_7(\mathrm{SO}(7),\mathrm{G}_2)\cong\pi_7(\mathbb{R}P^7)\cong\mathbb{Z}$ i.e., its homotopy class continues to be a generator. Taking into account that the third power of an inner automorphism is the identity it is clear that $j_*[F]=3[F|_{e^7}]$. Consequently, since $\pi_6(\mathrm{SO}(7))\cong 0$ we conclude from the homotopy exact sequence that $\pi_6(\mathrm{G}_2)\cong\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}=:\mathbb{Z}_3$ as desired.

Regarding the generator, it readily follows from (5) and (10) that $\partial(F|_{e^7})=f$ where $f:S^6\to\mathrm{G}_2$ is the map (6). Therefore $\partial_*[F|_{e^7}]=[f]\in\pi_6(\mathrm{G}_2)$. By exactness $\partial_*\neq 0$ and $F|_{e^7}$ represents the generator, hence its image f also represents a non-trivial element in $\pi_6(\mathrm{G}_2)$ which is the generator. $\diamond$

References

[1] Barth, W.P., Hulek, K., Peters, C.A.M., Van de Ven, A.: *Compact complex surfaces*, Springer, Berlin (2004);

[2] Campana, F., Demailly, J.-P., Peternell, T.: *The algebraic dimension of compact complex threefolds with vanishing second Betti number*, Compos. Math. **112**, 77-91 (1998);

[3] Chaves, L.M., Rigas, A.: *On a conjugate orbit of* G_2, Math. Journ. Okayama Univ. **33**, 155-161 (1991);

[4] Etesi, G.: *Complex structure on the six dimensional sphere from a spontaneous symmetry breaking*, Journ. Math. Phys. **56**, 043508-1-043508-22 (2015), Erratum: Journ. Math. Phys. **56**, 099901-1 (2015);

[5] Gray, A.: *A property of a hypothetical complex structure on the six-sphere*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. **B11**, 251-255 (1997);

[6] Huckleberry, A.T., Kebekus, S., Peternell, T.: *Group actions on* S^6 *and complex structures on* $\mathbb{P}_3$, Duke Math. Journ. **102**, 101-124 (2000);

[7] Lamont, P.: *Arithmetics in Cayley's algebra*, Proc. Glasgow Math. Ass. **6**, 99-106 (1963);

[8] LeBrun, C.: *Orthogonal complex structures on* S^6, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **101**, 136-138 (1987);

[9] Mimura, M.: *The homotopy groups of Lie groups of low rank*, Journ. Math. Kyoto Univ. **6**, 131-176 (1967);

[10] Pittie, H.: *The Dolbeault-cohomology ring of a compact even dimensional Lie group*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. **98**, 117-152 (1988);

[11] Samelson, H.: *A class of complex-analytic manifolds*, Portugalie Math. **12**, 129-132 (1953);

[12] Toda, H., Saito, Y., Yokota, T.: *A note on the generator of* $\pi_7(\mathrm{SO}(n))$, Mem. Coll. Sci. Univ. Kyoto **A30**, 227-230 (1957);

[13] Ugarte, L.: *Hodge numbers of a hypothetical complex structure on the six sphere*, Geom. Dedicata **81**, 173-179 (2000).